<u>Remarks</u>

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 112

In response to the Examiner's numerous rejections under USC § 112, the claims have been amended to improve their language and ensure that there is proper antecedent basis throughout.

In response to section 4 of the Office Action, claim 1 has been amended to define "receiving a request including a proposed change to the communications network". This amendment provides antecedent basis for the term "proposed change" in claim 1 and all its dependent claims. Furthermore, the term "pre-specified" in claim 1 has been amended to "specified". Corresponding amendments have been made to claims 17 and 18.

In response to section 5 of the Office Action, claim 2 has been amended to define the predicted level of link performance is calculated "on the basis of location information regarding each base station", removing the lack of antecedent basis in the claim.

In response to section 6 of the Office Action, claim 5 has been substantially reworked in order to improve its clarity, and to remove any lack of antecedent basis. Claim 5 now defines a method in which "said proposed change to the communications network comprises the addition of an additional subscriber station, and wherein said step (iii) further comprises keeping said additional subscriber station on hold and not effecting the proposed change if at least one of said determined levels of link performance is not greater than said specified level".

In response to section 7 of the Office Action, claim 6 has been amended to remove the lack of antecedent basis. Claim 6 now defines that the "proposed change to the communications network comprises the addition of an additional subscriber station and wherein said method further comprises the step of selecting a chosen base station with which the additional subscriber station is to communicate if the proposed change is effected". It is respectfully submitted that the scope of claim 6 is now clear, and that the requirements of the second paragraph of USC § 112 are now fully met.

Claim 7 has been amended to remove the lack of antecedent basis referred to by the Examiner. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted as a result of the amendments to claim 6, the scope of claim 7 is now clear, and that the requirements of the second paragraph of USC § 112 are now fully met.

Claim 10 has been amended to define that "if at least one of said determined levels of link performance is not greater than said specified level for said channel, the method further comprises selecting a different channel for communication between the additional subscriber station and the chosen base station". It is respectfully submitted that this amendment removes any lack of antecedent basis in claim 10, and improves the clarity of the claim.

In response to section 10 of the Office Action, claim 13 has been amended to introduce the "calculated value C/(I+A+N)" in order to improve the clarity of the claim. Furthermore, Claim 10 has been amended to remove any lack of clarity of lack of antecedent basis in the claim.

Claim 14 has also been amended to improve its clarity.

In response to section 11 of the Office Action, claim 19 has been amended to remove the lack of antecedent basis.

In response to section 12 of the Office Action, claim 20 has been amended to remove the lack of antecedent basis for "the locations" and "the frequencies". However, it is respectfully submitted that there is sufficient antecedent basis for "the fixed frequency plan", as "a fixed frequency plan" is defined early in the same claim.

It is respectfully submitted that, as a result of the amendments to the claims, all the rejections under USC § 112 are overcome, and the application is in condition for allowance. Such action is therefore solicited.

October 28, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Lee, Jr. Registration No. 26,935

Barnes & Thornburg

P.O. Box 2786

Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786

(312) 214-4800

(312) 759-5646 (fax)